

Already, working men and women pay for most of the infrastructure. They are the ones who are driving the cars, paying the fees and so forth. This, we have to tackle. We need to do it in a bipartisan way as Mr. JEFFRIES has suggested, but we ought to do it in a way that tries to claw back as much of that unnecessary wealth that has been transferred to the superwealthy.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I think that is exactly right. The gentleman's concerns and suspicions are well-founded based upon the approach that was taken by this Congress on the other side of the aisle in connection with the tax bill.

So the individual tax cuts, to the extent that there are any that will be felt by the American people, are modest; the corporate tax cuts are massive.

The individual tax cuts are temporary; the corporate tax cuts are permanent.

The ability of individuals to take a State and local tax deduction has been decimated; the ability of corporations to use the State and local tax deduction on their corporate tax return is untouched.

The moving expense deduction for individuals has been eliminated, but corporations can continue to take moving expense deductions for closing down a factory or a plant here in America and shipping those good-paying American jobs overseas to China, India, or other parts of the world.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, did I hear the gentleman correctly that an individual who lost their job, for whatever reason, and moves to another State can no longer deduct the moving expense? Is that correct?

Mr. JEFFRIES. That is correct.

Mr. GARAMENDI. However, a corporation that decides to close that plant, that facility, that laid off that individual, and open a factory in China can deduct the cost of doing that?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Something is radically wrong here.

Mr. JEFFRIES. It is totally outrageous, and it is exactly why the gentleman's concern about what our colleagues may be attempting to do with respect to the infrastructure bill is real. Because what we have just seen is an effort to massively transfer wealth from individuals and from everyday Americans to wealthy Americans and incredibly well-off corporations in ways that should never be possible in the United States of America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I was reading the tax bill yesterday, which is not a good read, and I found a provision that was of particular interest to me. Back in the 1990s, I was Deputy Secretary for the Department of the Interior, and we were trying to deal with the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska.

We have also, since that time, had this little thing called the Deepwater

Horizon. There has been a small 9-cents-per-barrel fee that the petroleum industry has been paying for the clean-up of oil spills. The big ones, Exxon Valdez and Deepwater Horizon, there was even more money as a result of the legal action taking care of them.

Little oil spills in the rivers and lakes and harbors are cleaned up using that fee. It is about \$400 million a year—small, but absolutely essential. In the tax bill, they eliminated that small fee, and it is a \$400 million windfall to the petroleum industry.

You go: Why would you do that? Who, then, is left to clean up? It is going to be the taxpayer in the State.

Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman mention State and local taxes? He is from New York. I am from California. Perhaps the two of us can get in a bit of a rage that the tax bill forces Californians, New Yorkers, Pennsylvanians, and Illinoisans to pay a tax on a tax that they have paid.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely. And I found this sort of whole discussion of trying to punish taxpayers in California, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Illinois, and Pennsylvania to benefit States in the Deep South or other parts of the country that already receive more from the Federal Government than they give in return to taxes to be outrageous, and this will just continue the inequity.

New York regularly sends \$40 billion more to the Federal Government than we get back in return, and they have just made a bad situation worse. The same for California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is probably not really appropriate that we get into a rage about the way in which this tax bill purposefully harms contributor States and forces the taxpayers in those States to pay Federal taxes on the taxes that they have paid to the State governments.

We could probably go on and on here for some time about the inequities and the harm that this tax bill does, and we certainly should. We should probably come back tomorrow and every day thereafter and tell the American people what has happened to them as a result of this tax scam.

In doing so, I really want to thank the gentleman and his two colleagues for developing, within the Democratic Caucus, a set of proposals, legislative proposals, policy changes, that will give the American public a better deal. We can juxtapose that against the tax bill, which is a raw deal for the American working family, but the gentleman has developed a better deal.

In the days ahead, I would love to join the gentleman and his colleagues juxtaposing the tax bill against the proposal that it is beneficial to working men and women in America, so perhaps we can do that.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would like to wrap up, I will follow him with a wrap-up.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I look forward continuing to work together for the gentleman's advocacy. We will dissect this tax bill for the American people, continue to discuss it, expose its fraudulent nature, and also lay out in clear terms the better deal we are offering, focused on better jobs, better wages, and a better future.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mrs. BUSTOS for developing the Better Deal program for our caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to end where I started. So, for the American people, I want them to know where we are coming from as Democrats: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little." If you want to know where I am coming from, read that sentence.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 140, AMENDING THE WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-503) on the resolution (H. Res. 681) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 140) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 139, RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-504) on the resolution (H. Res. 682) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 139) to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ESTES of Kansas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing about action that needs